

[DO NOT PUBLISH]

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

No. 04-14231
Non-Argument Calendar

FILED
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS
ELEVENTH CIRCUIT
April 19, 2005
THOMAS K. KAHN
CLERK

D. C. Docket No. 03-20077-CV-ASG

KEITH L. THOMPSON,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

versus

MIAMI-DADE COUNTY, a political subdivision
of State of Florida,

Defendants-Appellees,

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Southern District of Florida

(April 19, 2005)

Before ANDERSON, BLACK and WILSON, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:

Keith Thompson (“Thompson”) appeals the district court’s grant of summary judgment in favor of defendant Miami-Dade County in Thompson’s 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action alleging deliberate indifference in violation of the Eighth Amendment.

In December of 1999, Thompson alleges that he was the victim of inmate-on-inmate violence while he was an incarcerated in the Miami-Dade County Detention Center. He brought suit against, *inter alia*, Miami-Dade County, claiming that the County violated his Eighth Amendment rights to be free from cruel and unusual punishment. On cross-motions for summary judgment, the district court granted Miami-Dade County’s motion and denied Thompson’s motion.

We review a district court’s grant of summary judgment *de novo*, viewing the evidence in the light most favorable to the party opposing the motion. *Wilson v. B/E Aerospace, Inc.*, 376 F.3d 1079, 1085 (11th Cir. 2004). Summary judgment is appropriate when “there is no genuine issue was to any material fact and . . . the moving party is entitled to judgment as a matter of law.” Fed.R.Civ.P. 56(c).

We have carefully reviewed the record, the briefs of the parties, and the order of the district court on summary judgment. Construing the evidence in the

light most favorable to Thompson, it is clear that he has failed to present any genuine issues of material fact. The allegations raised and the evidence presented does not state a violation of the Eighth Amendment on the part of Miami-Dade county, and the county was entitled to judgment as a matter of law. Therefore, the well-reasoned opinion of the district court is

AFFIRMED.